

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

15 February 1946
INDEX

Page

II. ADMINISTRATION

3. Engineering Reports, Extension of West Front of the Capitol 1

III. REVIEWS-SUBMISSIONS

1. District of Columbia Government
- a. Department of Buildings and Grounds
- Central Library - Proposed Design 2
- b. Department of Licenses and Inspections
- Shipstead-Luce Act
- (a) Building Applications 2
- (b) Santa Maria Facilities, Southwest Waterfront 2
- (c) S.L. 66-73, 1615 North Portal Drive 2
- Old Georgetown Act
- (a) Building Applications 3
- (b) O.G. 66-200, 1814 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. 3
- (c) O.G. 66-206, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W.,
Additions to Georgetown University Medical Ctr 3
2. National Guard Association of the United States
- Proposed Monument Commemorating the Service of National
Guardsmen in Europe in World Wars I and II 3-4
3. National Institutes of Health
- Emergency Virus Isolation Facility and Master Plan 4
4. National Park Service, National Capital Region
- West Rawlins Park Development - Revised Design 4

5. Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company

Telephone Kiosk - Revised Design 5

IV. LEGISLATION ~~6~~ 5

V. INTERVIEWS

1. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Central Library - Proposed Design 5-6

2. National Institutes of Health

Emergency Virus Isolation Facility and Master Plan 6

3. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park Development - Revised Design 7

4. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

O.G. 66-206, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W., Additions and Alterations to Georgetown University Medical Center 7

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 15 February 1966. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:15 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki (afternoon session)
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Legislative Asst.
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: Arnall T. Connell

Recorder: Leone M. Vialpando

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. The Commission decided to hold its next meeting on 16-17 March 1966.

2. The minutes of the January 1966 meeting were approved. At the request of Mr. Roszak, the members discussed the Commission's action taken on the site for Georgetown University Library. The members upheld the Chairman's summation of their views as expressed in a letter of 27 January 1966 to officials of the University.

3. Engineering Report, Extension of the West Front of the Capitol

The Commission deferred action on the Engineering Report until the members could study it thoroughly. If necessary, Dr. Meng Te Chang will be requested to discuss his report with the members.

III. REVIEWS-SUBMISSIONS

1. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Buildings and Grounds

Central Library - Proposed Design

The Secretary presented two models, photographs, and drawings of the Central Library designed by Mies Van Der Rohe for a site at G Street between 9th and 10th Streets, N.W. Of black painted steel and bronze-gray glass, three stories of the library would be lifted on columns above the entire square with lobby and reading rooms, enclosed in glass, recessed behind the columns. The Secretary stated that the architect hoped to use granite on the floor inside the building and would like to continue the use of granite out to the curb line.

The Commission withheld final action until a meeting with the architect during the afternoon session.

b. Department of Licenses and Inspections

Shipstead-Luce Act

(a) Building Applications

The Commission approved the action taken by the staff on Shipstead-Luce Applications listed on Appendix I. EXHIBIT A

(b) Santa Maria Facilities, Southwest Waterfront

The Secretary presented drawings of a design for a temporary shed, sign and extension to the existing pier for the Santa Maria replica. The modest treatment which eliminated previously proposed Spanish architecture was planned by Chloethiel Woodward Smith and Associates. The Commission had no objections to these plans which the Redevelopment Land Agency considered appropriate for the area.

A report of the Commission's approval was forwarded to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(c) S.L. 66-73, 1615 North Portal Drive - Design of Dwellings

The Secretary presented drawings submitted by Kohler, Misner, and Daniels, architectural firm, for this project located on the periphery of Rock Creek Park. The Commission had no objection to these plans because the site is remote from that area of Washington which is the Commission's concern.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

Old Georgetown Act

(a) Building Applications

There were no objections to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT B

(b) O.G. 66-200, 1814 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., 4-story office building - Proposed Design

The Secretary presented drawings prepared by Earl Von Reichenbach, architect for this project. The Commission approved the plans and recommended that details be submitted as they develop and that samples of materials be furnished.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(c) O.G. 66-206, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W., Additions and Alterations to Georgetown University Medical Center

Parking Areas

The Secretary presented and the Commission approved plans for parking areas developed by Mariani and Associates, for this project. Revised to have a minimum of surface parking spaces, the plans indicated a berm along the wall and landscaping. Other parking would be available on several levels underground. The Commission's approval was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

Additions and Alterations

The Secretary presented drawings for a one-story element that will connect the existing hospital building to a new addition, developed by Mariani and Associates, architectural firm. Drawings of the new addition were presented, also. Recognizing the architect's intention of attempting to blend designs of the old and new structures, the Commission felt that a more architectural approach should have been given to this problem. The members recommended that the project be restudied.

Final action was withheld until a meeting with the architect during the afternoon session.

2. National Guard Association of the United States

Proposed Monument Commemorating the Service of National Guardsmen in Europe in World Wars I and II

The Secretary presented drawings and photographs of a design by

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

FROM THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

RESOLVED, That the Faculty of the University of Chicago, in response to the invitation of the President, do hereby express their appreciation of the services rendered by the President during his term of office.

AND THAT the Faculty of the University of Chicago, in response to the invitation of the President, do hereby express their appreciation of the services rendered by the President during his term of office.

AND THAT the Faculty of the University of Chicago, in response to the invitation of the President, do hereby express their appreciation of the services rendered by the President during his term of office.

ADOPTED

AT A MEETING OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, HELD AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, ON THE 15TH DAY OF MAY, 1954.

WITNESSED

THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, BY ITS PRESIDENT, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING RESOLUTIONS WERE ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, HELD AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, ON THE 15TH DAY OF MAY, 1954.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, BY ITS PRESIDENT, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING RESOLUTIONS WERE ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, HELD AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, ON THE 15TH DAY OF MAY, 1954.

ATTEST

THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, BY ITS PRESIDENT, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING RESOLUTIONS WERE ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, HELD AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, ON THE 15TH DAY OF MAY, 1954.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, BY ITS PRESIDENT, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING RESOLUTIONS WERE ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, HELD AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, ON THE 15TH DAY OF MAY, 1954.

Francois Carpentier, architect, for this monument in Vierville-Sur-Mer, France. As planned, an existing block house (old German bunker) would have a granite superstructure constructed on top of it. Steps would lead up to the superstructure. A paved parking area would be adjacent to the block house.

The Commission was opposed to building anything on top of the block house. The members suggested that an appropriate element identifying the historic event be erected somewhere in the area of the block house. This feature would make this monument distinct from other block houses along the coast. The Commission felt the design should be restudied.

The Commission's action was reported to the National Guard Association.
EXHIBIT C

3. National Institutes of Health

Emergency Virus Isolation Facility and Master Plan

The Secretary presented drawings prepared by Saunders and Thomas, Inc., architectural-engineering firm, for this project. The Commission felt that the quality of planning and architecture was not appropriate, that the site and building should be redesigned.

In discussing the problem, the members commented that a master plan should include a well done circulation and land use plan. The circulation plan should be developed in two phases: a central basic order and a more detailed stage. The land use plan should be general, subject to revisions, and approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. Projected building needs should be a part of a master plan. Buildings should be designed in relation to each other and in relation to the whole area.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of NIH and the architect during the afternoon session.

4. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park Development - Revised Design

The Secretary presented drawings prepared by the National Park Service staff for this project. The recommendations of the Commission that the center area should be open and single rows of trees planned for the side areas were incorporated in the revised design. A large statue was planned for the west terminal area across 20th Street from the park. The members commented on the closeness of the trees and recommended that more space be provided. The pools on either side of the Park should be narrower.

Final action was withheld until a meeting with National Park Service representatives in the afternoon.

5. Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company

Telephone Kiosk - Revised Design

The Secretary presented and the Commission approved a design developed by Henry Dreyfuss for the Bell Laboratories for this project. He stated that the curved sections of this bronze and oyster shell design were on different radii to prevent acoustic reflections, the glass panels permitted better visibility and lighting, and that the suspended shelf permitted self clearing. The Commission approved the design and suggested that upper case lettering be used and reduced to cover half of each cornice.

The Commission's approval and suggestion were reported to the Telephone Company. EXHIBIT D

IV. LEGISLATION

The Secretary presented the following proposed legislation. Copies of the legislation and the Commission's report are listed as exhibits.

1. H.R. 12298-1/25/66-Mr. Pepper-89thC

To require that at least 1 per cent of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings.

The Commission requested that further research be given to this bill. The members commented that at least 1% of funds for construction of Federal buildings should be used for art at the discretion of the architect.

EXHIBIT E

2. S. 2338-7/28/65-Mr. Symington-89thC

To authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to General John J. Pershing.

The Commission was not opposed to the enactment of this bill. The members recommended that it be reworded to provide that the site and design be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

EXHIBIT F

V. INTERVIEWS

1. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Central Library - Proposed Design

Mr. G. A. Purcell, Liaison Officer, D.C. Department of Buildings and Grounds; Mr. Mies Van Der Rohe and his assistant, Mr. Summers, architects;

Mr. Atwood of the Library Board, and Mr. Peterson, Director of the Library, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Van Der Rohe stated that he had recommended to the Library Board that the land acquired east of the site for a parking lot be used for the building and underground parking planned. Commenting on materials, he stated that he preferred granite for the promenade and sidewalk areas. The Commission felt that the architect's preference should be granted.

Mr. Atwood and Mr. Peterson commended ~~the~~ ²² the design and plans which were considered esthetic and functional for a library. The Library Board had approved both the design and plans.

The Commission unanimously approved the excellent design and congratulated the Library members for employing a good architect. The Commission's action was reported to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia. EXHIBIT G

2. National Institutes of Health

Emergency Virus Isolation Facility and Master Plan (added to order of business).

Mr. Hanson of National Institutes of Health and Mr. Ritchie, representing the architectural firm of Sanders and Thomas, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Warnecke requested that the long term needs, covering 20 or 25 years, and programs of National Institutes of Health be explained so that the Commission could advise on the site and designs of buildings proposed. He stated that unless the Commission has a program to gauge the design and master plan by, decisions would be made on a series of unrelated buildings sited in a helter-skelter manner throughout the campus.

Replying, Mr. Hanson commented that the master plan was designed to accommodate 12,000 to 14,000 people and would be limited to those figures. He stated that the Emergency Virus Isolation Facility was originally planned in another area but from an economic and operational standpoint, could not be constructed there. The site selected was considered an isolation area. He remarked that if NIH knew precisely what was needed in the future and if adequate research had been done this facility might have been included in another building.

Mr. Bunshaft stated that officials of NIH should program requirements in larger increments. He expressed the members' views by stating that the Commission could not approve either the design of the building or its site. He remarked that a site plan for this specific area of the master plan should be developed as well as the design for a building. For the record, the transcript of the meeting is EXHIBIT H.

5/27 ~~The Commission's disapproval was reported to NIH officials.~~

EXHIBIT I
~~deleted~~

3. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park Development - Revised Design

Mr. Turello, National Park Service, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Sasaki expressed the Commission's approval of the design and recommended that more space should be allowed between trees in the peripheral area, the pool copings should be wide enough to sit on, and granite should be used rather than concrete. He suggested that details be submitted as plans are developed.

The Commission's approval was reported to the National Park Service.

EXHIBIT J

4. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses & Inspections

O.G. 66-206, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W., Additions and Alterations to Georgetown University Medical Center

Mr. Mariani attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mrs. Saarinen expressed the Commission's disapproval of submitted designs for a new hospital wing. She remarked that the design of this addition should be linked to proposals for all future building in the vicinity. The design submitted did not indicate an architectural approach to the problem. The members felt that viewed from the campus the building would be overwhelming in its monotony.

Exhibit K

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections, District of Columbia Government.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



C. H. Atherton
Secretary

2/15/66

NO
SL 66-
ADDRESS AND OWNERPROJECT

71 7980 West Beach Dr., NW
Harry Burton

Constr. & erect new 1-family dwelling.

ACTION: App'd., provided proper landscaping & cover are included, especially on sloped areas of site, 2/10/66.

72 601-19th St., NW
601-19th St., Inc.

Install flagstone over exist. concrete at entr. to bldg. New rails. & pickets & 2 free-standing lamps at entr. to bldg.

ACTION: Disap'd. See action on S. L. 66-50, 1/18/66.

74 310-1st St., SE
Capitol Hill Assoc., Inc.

Revised drawings for 4-story office bldg.

ACTION: No obj. to proposed concept. Recom. restudy of penthouse & mechanical equip. requirements. Could these elements be located in the basem., 2/10/66.

75 2425 Virginia Ave., NW
McLachlen Banking Corp.

Replace exist. signs with 2 s-f signs. 73½ sq-ft total. Illuminated. Metal & plastic, black & white.

ACTION: Disap'd. Eliminate translucent ltr. faces. These are not permitted in S-L or O-G areas. Recom. ltrs. have opaque faces with neon as shown. Signs not to exceed 25 sq-ft. Suggest that ltrs. be 12" high & respaced over glass area only, 2/15/66.

76 235-2nd St., NE
Assembly Restaurant

Install two 20' alum. cone-tapered heavy-duty flagpoles.

ACTION: Resubm. with accurate scale drawings, showing exact dimensioned locations of flagpoles, 2/10/66.

78 3636-16th St., NW
Rock Creek Plaza, Inc.

Constr. swimming pool, replacing present courtyard overlook structure.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Show type & location for proposed pool area lighting fixtures. Show elevations of the retaining wall & panel rail details. Show screen planting around ret. wall, 2/15/66.

PROJECT

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

SL 66-

73 1615 N. Portal Dr., NW 2-story residence (brick).
Oscar Margulies

ACTION: No obj. Remote relationship to Rock Creek Park minimizes impairment of public values, 2/15/66.

77 Pier No. 3 - Main Ave., SW
RLA - San-Mar Inc.

General renovation of shelter; erection of new wood decking on
exist. piles; install new elec. system; erection of new ramp
to pier.

ACTION: No obj. to design of tempo. shed, sign or timber extension on exist. pier, 2/15/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

2/15/66

NO
OG 66-

ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

185	3032 Cambridge Pl., NW Robert W. Linville	Constr. a straight redwood staircase from 1st fl. rear porch to grade.
ACTION: Recom'd. Suggest stair rail be wood & match porch rail with same spacing of verticals, 2/3/66.		
186	1053-31st St., NW A. Stuart Mitchell	Individual 5" black metal ltrs: "Allen Mitchell & Company"
ACTION: Recom'd., 1/25/66.		
187	2900 P St., NW Mrs Reginald F. Chutter	Constr. 9' x 20' sun deck w/iron rail.
ACTION: No obj., provided wood skirting is added to hide pipe columns from the rear. Skirting will continue down to about 2" from roof deck, 2/3/66.		
188	3215 Scott Pl., NW Geo. E. Via	Brick ret. wall approx. 5' high & 11' long. Brick will match brick of house facade & coursing will tie in with house coursing. Brick coping on top.
ACTION: Ret'd. for more inf. Incl. a site plan showing location of proposed work, 1/24/66.		
190	3419 N St., NW Virginia Hall	2 lamps.
ACTION: Recom'd., 2/3/66.		
191	1045-30th St., NW Parking Lot	1 d-f sign. 40" x 46". Black ltrs. on white bckgd.
ACTION: No obj. to sign which, it is noted, already exists, 2/3/66.		

APPENDIX 2

EXHIBIT B

1. The first part of the book is devoted to a general introduction to the subject of the book.

2. The second part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

3. The third part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

4. The fourth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

5. The fifth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

6. The sixth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

7. The seventh part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

8. The eighth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

9. The ninth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

10. The tenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

11. The eleventh part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

12. The twelfth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

13. The thirteenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

14. The fourteenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

15. The fifteenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

16. The sixteenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

17. The seventeenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

18. The eighteenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject.

NO
OG 66-ADDRESS AND OWNERPROJECT

192

1512-31st St., NW
Rob't. H. Phillips Trust

Replace fixed glass showwindow with d/h wood windows.

ACTION: Recom'd. Wood trim to be painted white, 2/3/66.

193

3108 "O" St., NW
Christ Episcopal Church

Remodel exist. Choir Practice Room-Library into a small Memorial Chapel & 3 small Sunday School classrooms. into a new Choir Practice Room-Library on 2nd fl.

ACTION: Prel. app'd., subj. to devel. of forecourt, dormer door & canopy details, 2/3/66.

194

1338 Wisc. Ave., NW
Helen C. Donahue

Constr. sidewalk protection roof at 1228 Wisc. Ave. & 3204 "O" St., NW while remodeling & removing rubble.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided the structure is painted neutral grey. Omit all signs, 2/3/66.

196

1403 Wisc. Ave., NW
Peoples Drug Store

4 signs.

ACTION: Superseded by OG 66-207, 2/10/66.

197

1063 Wisc. Ave., NW
Hugo Formato

Request CFA to reconsider recom. to omit valances on awnings subm'd. previously under OG 66-117.

ACTION: Recom'd. for roll-type awning, provided that front & side valances be eliminated & that lettering be eliminated. Request resubm. of drawing, 2/10/66.

198

1271 Wisc. Ave., NW
M. A. Fisher (Commercial)

Remove exist. pair of entr. doors. Build new entry with 2 doors into stores & window in entry. Side door on "N" St. remove & build showwindow to be a copy of exist. corner window.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that entry window chimney roof be eliminated & blocked-up door & window above on "N" St. be bricked up & made a solid panel & the 4/4 window east of "N" St. entr. be changed to 6/6. Request revised drawings, 2/9/66.

1. The first part of the book is devoted to a general introduction to the subject.

2. The second part is devoted to a detailed study of the various aspects of the subject.

3. The third part is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.

4. The fourth part is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.

5. The fifth part is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.

6. The sixth part is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.

7. The seventh part is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.

8. The eighth part is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.

9. The ninth part is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.

10. The tenth part is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

199 1271 Wisc. Ave., NW 2 exterior roof top air cond. units.

M. A. Fisher (Commercial)

ACTION: Recom'd., provided air cond. units painted neutral color such as gray, 2/9/66.

201 2713 P St., NW

Mary Leimbach

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that lights are taller than wide, 2/10/66. Remove exist. 4 panel wood door & replace with multi-pane glass/wood door (French door). No change in size.

202 2831 M St., NW

Cities Service Oil Co., Inc.

Exist. sign to be removed & replaced with a non-illuminated 25 sq-ft sign.

ACTION: Not recom'd. No obj. to text, but suggest that steel post be painted white. Substitute opaque material for translucent plastic, reduce thickness of sign & provide suitable frame, 2/15/66.

203 1367 Wisc. Ave., NW

John Molyneux (Commercial)

Remodelling, new front veneer at 1st fl. level. New entr., doors, windows, upper fl. sash.

ACTION: Not recom'd. All schemes presented are too complicated, suggest simple more authentic details. Question the necessity of new brick veneer; 1st fl. & upper fls. should be the same color. Recom. restudy of 1st fl. treatment, 2/15/66.

204 3234 N St., NW

Mr & Mrs J. V. Mladek

Addn. at rear & general remodeling.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided rear elevation of house is painted white, 2/9/66.

205 1315-31st St., NW

Mrs Harold J. Coolidge

Remove exist. multi-story porch on so. side of exist. residence & constr. garage with terrace above garage in area so. of exist. residence.

ACTION: Resubm. showing exact relationship of proposed work to adjacent garage cornice. Also incl. in drawings exact relationship of proposed work to exist. house, as it will appear from the st. Suggest possibility of a coping or cornice on top of new wall & some relief to frame door opening. Study the possibility of blending some exist. vertical dimensions & details from adjacent house & garage into new addn., 2/10/66.

2/15/66

NO
OG 66-PROJECT206 3800 Reservoir Rd., NW
Georgetown University

ADDNS. & alterations at Medical Cntr: 1. New tempo. park lots.
 2. Relocate cooling tower. 3. New multi-level park. decks. 4.
 Mental retardation unit Hospital addn.
 ACTION: See ltr. dtd. 2/15/66 to Ass't. Superintendent of Licenses & Permits, 2/15/66.

207 1403 Wisc. Ave., NW
Peoples Drug Stores

4 signs. 39 sq-ft total. Illuminated.

ACTION: No obj. to sign in concept. Ltr. style should be better design. Use good, standard, vertical,
 professional type face, 2/10/66.

208 2611 Dumbarton St., NW
Mrs Geo. Webster

Build wall, install door, window, etc. for new powder rm.

ACTION: Recom'd. Suggest that air-cond. equip. be screened, 2/10/66.

210 3336 "O" St., NW
Jack Gilbert1 flood light on side of bldg. near rear. 12' above grade.
75 watt.

ACTION: Recom'd., 2/15/66.

200 1814 Wisc. Ave., NW
Peter C. Laganas (Commercial)

4-story office bldg. incl. 3 pictures of coach lights.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided further details are submitted as they develop. These shall incl. details of
 penthouse & all other mechanical equip. that protrudes through the roof or walls of the bldg. Submit material
 samples, 2/15/66.

February 21, 1966

Dear General Cantwell:

At its February 15th meeting, the Commission of Fine Arts disapproved the design proposed to commemorate the services of National Guardsmen in Europe in two World Wars.

The Commission found the design inappropriate and recommends that there be no construction on top of the bunker itself. We suggest considering a free-standing memorial nearby the bunker.

Our next meeting will be on March 16th and 17th, and we will be glad to review further studies should they be ready at that time.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Major General James F. Cantwell
President
National Guard Association of the
United States
1 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

21 February 1966

Dear Mr. Alberding:

At its meeting on February 15, the Commission of Fine Arts considered the design of a proposed telephone kiosk for use in the formal, downtown, and memorial areas of the District of Columbia. The Commission found the design to be much improved over the previous telephone booth proposals and approved the design as submitted.

Approval was granted with the understanding that lettering will be modified to cover only half of each cornice. This will permit nesting of booths as indicated in your drawings. We question the use of lower case letters in the formal areas of Washington and recommend that you use simple uppercase letters.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Arthur V. Alberding
Commercial Manager
Coin Telephone Service
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.
1351 R St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

EXHIBIT D

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 12298

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 25, 1966

Mr. PEPPER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To require that at least 1 per centum of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this
4 Act (1) to encourage the development of a strong and vital
5 American art through maximum use of American artists
6 in the decoration and beautification of Federal buildings;
7 (2) to promote the progress of the useful arts; (3) to
8 secure suitable art of the best quality for the decoration
9 and beautification of buildings of the Federal Government
10 in this country and in foreign countries; (4) to carry out

1 this work in such a way as will best assist in stimulating
2 the development of American art and rewarding the out-
3 standing talent which develops; and (5) to encourage and
4 secure local participation and autonomy to the greatest
5 extent compatible with the quality of the programs author-
6 ized by this Act.

7 (b) As used in this Act—

8 (1) the term “decoration and beautification” in-
9 cludes murals, mosaics, paintings, sculpture (including
10 architectural and monumental sculpture), ironwork,
11 pottery, weaving, woodcarving, stonework, and artistic
12 work in other media.

13 (2) the term “Administrator” means the Adminis-
14 trator of General Services.

15 (3) the term “Federal agency” means any depart-
16 ment, agency, or establishment of the Federal Govern-
17 ment.

18 (c) Whenever a nonmilitary public building is to be
19 constructed by or under contract to a Federal agency, the
20 Administrator, the head of the Federal agency performing
21 the construction, and the head of the Federal agency which
22 will have custody and control over such building upon its
23 completion shall jointly determine what percentage of the
24 total amount of money available for the construction of such
25 building should be used to provide decoration and beautifi-

1 cation work for such building, except that such percentage
2 shall not be less than 1 per centum of such amount. Such
3 determination shall, whenever practicable, be made in ad-
4 vance of the availability of the funds for such construction,
5 and shall be based upon a consideration of the purposes for
6 which the building is to be used, the types of decoration and
7 beautification work which would be most fitting and appro-
8 priate in the light of such purposes, and any other factors
9 deemed relevant by the Administrator and such agency
10 heads. Within the limits of the percentage determined un-
11 der the first sentence of this subsection, the Administrator
12 and such agency heads shall jointly prescribe the type and
13 extent of the decoration and beautification work, if any, to
14 be provided for such building, and shall select the artists,
15 sculptors, or other persons to execute such work.

16 (d) There is hereby established an advisory board
17 (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "board"),
18 which shall advise and consult with the Administrator in
19 the performance of his duties under this Act. The board
20 shall consist of the Chairman of the National Endowment
21 for the Arts established by the National Foundation on the
22 Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, the Secretary of the
23 Smithsonian Institution, and seven other members appointed
24 by the Administrator from among private citizens of the
25 United States who are widely recognized for their knowl-

1 edge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, the
2 fields of decoration and beautification work and architecture,
3 and whose knowledge and experience in such fields will
4 enable them to assist the Administrator in the performance
5 of his duties under this Act. In making such appointments
6 the Administrator shall give due consideration to the recom-
7 mendations for nomination submitted by leading national
8 organizations in the fields of decoration and beautification
9 work and architecture. The term of office of each member
10 of the board appointed by the Administrator shall be two
11 years; except that, of the members first appointed, four shall
12 be appointed for terms of one year. No member of the
13 board appointed by the Administrator shall be eligible for
14 reappointment during the one-year period following the
15 expiration of his term. The board shall meet at the call
16 of the Administrator, but not less often than twice each year.
17 The Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts shall
18 be chairman of the board.

19 (e) In order to secure the participation of the best
20 possible talent under this Act, there shall be established such
21 procedures as may be deemed appropriate by the Admin-
22 istrator to provide for the award of commissions without
23 competition, as well as for the award of commissions through
24 competitions in which artists are invited to compete and are
25 paid for designs submitted.

- 1 SEC. 2. This Act shall not be deemed to invalidate any
- 2 provision in any Act of Congress or Executive order vesting
- 3 authority in the Commission of Fine Arts.

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2338

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 28 (legislative day, JULY 27), 1965.

Mr. SYMINGTON introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to General John J. Pershing.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to provide
4 for the erection of a memorial to the late John J. Pershing,
5 General of the Armies of the United States, such memorial
6 to be erected—

7 (1) in accordance with the plans and design sub-
8 mitted by the American Battle Monuments Commission
9 to the Congress pursuant to Public Law 461, Eighty-
10 fourth Congress (70 Stat. 84) ; and

11 (2) on a parcel of federally owned land in the

1 northwest section of the District of Columbia or in
2 Arlington County, State of Virginia.

3 SEC. 2. The maintenance and care of the memorial
4 herein authorized to be erected shall, upon completion, be
5 the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

6 SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
7 such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions
8 of this Act.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

February 21, 1966

Dear Charlie:

It will come as no surprise to you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on February 15th, gave enthusiastic approval to Mies Van Der Rohe's design for the new central library. This letter is merely for your record.

With congratulations and best wishes for more architecture of this caliber.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bill", written in dark ink.

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General C. M. Duke
Engineer Commissioner for the
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

EXHIBIT G

good architect and a good client. Apparently we've got both, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mies, it's a very happy moment to tell you the Commission of Fine Arts wholeheartedly and unanimously approves your design and thinks the City of Washington is lucky to have it. We hope it will perhaps be just the first.

MR. MIES van der ROHE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you for coming, and I thank the Library Board, too, for coming.

MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman and members, thank you very much for having us.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're delighted; thanks a lot.

- - -

(N.I.H. - Emergency Virus Isolation Facility)

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Hanson, do you want to make a presentation here?

MR. HANSON: Well, I wasn't sure what was planned.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're not really planning a presentation. There has been one, but come on up and we'll just have a little dialogue. We have asked Mr. Bunshaft and Mr. Warnecke to comment, to serve as our representatives.

Are you from the architectural firm?

MR. HANSON: No, I'm from the National Institutes

Health.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's what we're really getting at.

Mr. Warnecke, do you want to lead off on our general views of this problem?

MR. WARNECKE: Well, one of the things we discussed this morning is that it is very difficult for us to approve isolated buildings when we don't know what your long-term needs and programs are going to be for, say, the next 20 or 25 years. You may double the size of the entire complex. We are approving a series of buildings helter skelter on the edges. Are we making the right kinds of decisions approving even these kinds of facilities? Unless we have a program to gauge the design and master plan by -- I suppose the best you can do is explain what is going to happen. It might help us to explain how you see this and what your problems are. Is this possible to do?

MR. HANSON: We felt it was. We felt that in order to make a reasonable, rational plan we had to have some objective in terms of numbers of people and the extent of development and of course this was behind the original master site plan. I say the original. The most recent group master plans of the site was developed in 1958. At that time we had very extensive discussions on how far we'd go

in covering the landscape up with buildings and parking sites, and so on; and at that time the conclusion reached was based on a recommendation of our Master Site Committee, and a decision was a maximum of 12,000 to 14,000 people on the reservation; again, in order to insure we did not develop in a hodge podge fashion, that we lay out the buildings that would house 12,000 to 14,000 people, and as far as we were able to control it, that is, N.I.H., we would limit it to that.

What you see before you here represents all the buildings we intend to put down there. Now I should make one comment, however. This area around the corner here (indicating on site development plan) is a bit of a problem for a number of reasons. The incinerator plant which is in Building No. 11 right here (indicating) has been a major problem because of size, because of inadequate design. We are not able to handle incineration of wastes. We considered the possibility of hauling it off the grounds and disposal through county facilities. This was not feasible because the county did not want to handle -- they did not feel their facilities would permit them to handle infectious waste, so we had to make some arrangements for the possibility of an incinerator building. We are now in the process of studying it and the logical location was to keep it as close as possible to the power house and other buildings, but this seemed to be

the most desirable possibility of location.

We have authorization for a warehouse building right in here (indicating); extension of that building is also planned for hopefully in the next one to three years. We also have a problem in the area back in here (indicating), where our computer facilities are.

We had an inadequate garage and firehouse in there and we wanted that removed from this very active area in here, and the precise location of these buildings has not been worked out, frankly.

Our present plant seems to suggest this location here (indicating) for the warehouse. However, in discussing this with the National Capital Planning Commission, they are interested in the possibility of putting the warehouse over on this side and moving this over there (indicating), but that is under study.

This is the major area. If you have ever driven down Cedar Lane, this is a really lovely site, all trees, and we're improving the landscape on it as rapidly as we can. We would rather not develop that; we'd rather leave it as it now is, but we feel if additional space is necessary, laboratory space, this is the only major area of development left except this location here (indicating), which we've discussed a number of times for an international

building, primarily a conference building, auditorium-conference building, so to summarize, all of the buildings that we now plan for are on this sketch as it is now shown. The limit of population is 12,000 to 14,000.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: One of our feelings has been that perhaps it was being approached too much in bits and pieces, the whole concept of it, and that conceivably you could make a case for no construction for three or four years until you knew better what your future needs would be, and instead of so many little buildings spotted all around you might have a multipurpose building of much larger scale and bulk that was going to provide many of these facilities that you need.

MR. HANSON: That is what you have in this development here (indicating), the Cancer Neuro buildings, a rather large building of very flexible design. We did not plan to put more small buildings on here. The building you're now considering, the Cancer Virus Building, came about because we were unable to plan intelligently for it out at the Animal Center. Our initial plan was to put it out there, but from an economic basis, that is, providing the necessary utilities and from the operational basis, we did not feel that we could handle it out at the Animal Center. We put it at this location, and we consider it more or less

a temporary building. Now the building is of rather permanent appearance, as you see, but there are many aspects of the building that are temporary and the reason we built a one-floor building here which is rather limited was the fact that the facilities which we now have are inadequate, unsatisfactory for doing the type of virus isolation research work that we need to do, and frankly, the knowledge that is necessary to provide containment is quite sparse now, and this building is designed, half of it is based on the better known containment type facility, the other half is open, almost warehouse type, where we will do research work on better containment facilities.

If we were able to put this -- if we knew precisely what we wanted in the long haul, if adequate research had been done, this type of operation would probably have been included in one of the other buildings, but we don't feel we have adequate knowledge to move on it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is an isolation area then?

MR. HANSON: That is an isolation area, correct.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Warnecke.

MR. WARNECKE: When you say the ultimate campus will house 12,000 people, what does it now house?

MR. HANSON: We now have plus or minus 8500 people.
people.

MR. WARNECKE: When you reach 12,000 what do you do -- do you move to some other location?

MR. HANSON: Well, it would be really presumptuous of me in view of N.I.H. history to say when we reach 12,000 that's the end. I don't know. The Director, Dr. Shannon, has consistently hoped to limit the development so we'd not have a concentration of additional buildings. As it now stands, we do not intend to build beyond the buildings that are projected.

MR. WARNECKE: Do you expect to complete this in five to ten years?

MR. HANSON: That's a hard question. This area here, as I said, is the only major development area. At the present time, N.I.H. planning does not include building that in the next five years, but I can't tell you that it won't come up in three to five years. It could. We hope it won't.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Do you have a master planner or architect for this site?

MR. HANSON: Yes, we did. To answer your question specifically, the plan that you see here is essentially the same basic plan that was developed in 1958 when Mr. Clark

and Mr. Walker were with us in developing the plan.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What Mr. Clark is that?

MR. HANSON: Gilmore Clark.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Was he commissioned to study that?

MR. HANSON: Yes, he and Mr. Ralph Walker and Mr. Nelson, the Vice President of New York Life in charge of their development work in New York City. They were the three, and the support work was provided by Walker's firm. The plan you see here is essentially basically the same plan. We have updated to provide, for instance, the specific size and location of the new facilities here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Who sited those?

MR. HANSON: The architect, an architectural firm, but the general location was provided in the master plan.

MRS. SAARINEN: Were these buildings like the one now under discussion, part of the master plan also?

MR. HANSON: In the 1958 master plan a building was shown in that particular location, yes. In the 1961 plan, there was extensive discussion here on the peripheral road; that is, the extension of the parkway, and after debate, considerable debate, we left it off and --

MRS. SAARINEN: That's one of our questions.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What we are concerned with is, this is, you know you say 12,000 to 14,000. Nobody knows. This may be a center for 40,000 if some development takes place

and we think this is being done in bits and pieces due to programs, perhaps, or due to funds, and we think there ought to be some effort made from the top using people to program requirements in bigger chunks. Maybe wait a year or two instead of every doctor -- this land is being mutilated as far as we are concerned. All these little brown things over here (indicating model) -- we're talking about we're not going to approve at all. And here is another little one here (indicating). You are just taking a great big hunk of land and putting little one-story shacks on it, which seems to us wasteful and some day we'll all be cursed for it when this develops, and what we are talking about is: it isn't for architects and it isn't for building people -- it's for top research people and the administration to think, doing this in bigger segments, like this thing ought to be incorporated in some flexible research space that you could move this thing up and move something else in.

We are doing hospitals ourselves, and the tendency in anything is to get bulk space and have freedom, not build a little igloo for every little study program.

Also, there is no brilliant architect involved in any master planning here. I don't know what these two brown shapes are or how they got that wiggly shape.

MR. HANSON: These are major building sites. All

this represents is a site and a major one.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is a big hunk of land with, as I see it, three little boxes on it, each one with its own little parking, own little roads. There is no planning to that. That is like selling real estate. That's no architectural planning or any kind of planning. For example, here is a building by itself, has a front door, parking lot and a back. Service. Here's another one (indicating) being proposed that has a parking lot and its front door or its main approach is by this other parking lot. There isn't any effort to consolidate services, approaches, or anything and darn it, something like that has to happen if it's going to get through this group. We are not talking about that solely. That's easy. We can disapprove that. But what we are pleading about is some effort toward getting the best talents available, but that isn't what I'm talking about; it's trying to get consolidation, so you don't build everything in little bits and pieces.

MR. HANSON: Well, other than that building there --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, look at this. What are all these little things? Also, for example, in good planning you might say you're not going to use this land at all, you're going to leave this for a future great big development.

MR. WARNECKE: That you don't know about.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That you don't know about. That's what you might do.

MR. HANSON: As we have done here --

MR. BUNSHAFT: You're filling it up there.

MR. HANSON: No, no. This is a major future building site.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Maybe these things can be stopped in here and this ought to be reserved for something 20 years from now. Look at this land here (indicating) with two little tepees on about 15 acres.

MR. HANSON: There that you call one tepee is a major research building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How many square feet is that building

MR. HANSON: It's an estimate of -- and this is a very early stage of planning -- about \$14 million worth of building; if you call that a tepee, that's a tepee.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is that the mass of it?

MR. HANSON: No, it's only a symbol.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This isn't a symbol, this is a model of a building, so is that one, and I assume that is a model of a building (indicating).

MR. HANSON: We've not reached that point.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But how can you decide these two are going to be here and nothing else, and that you have the

parking grounds right at the front door?

MR. HANSON: Back door.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How do you enter this building -- this building right here (indicating)?

MR. HANSON: An earlier plan had a road going there.

MR. WARNECKE: If that's a \$14 million building, that's going to be ten times larger than that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You ought to have the best talent in the country working on this, if you're talking about \$14 million, a parking garage symbolized here. I don't know if there is any plan around this site.

MR. HANSON: It was updated in 1961.

MR. BUNSHAFT: By whom?

MR. HANSON: By the same group, And the updating that's going on right now --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, we are trying to help you.

MR. HANSON: I appreciate it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I have a belligerent way of talking but I do think the land is not being used to its best advantage is all. I think that is the point, and we'd plead on consolidating these things.

MR. HANSON: We certainly don't object --

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are working, our office personally on a hospital for Mt Sinai, and they had a committee and an

architect. He held off all the things they wanted for about five or six years. Each one wanted something, you know -- \$2 million or \$5 million. Now they're going to build a whole new center about \$60 million in one building. Of course it's not this sort of thing at all. You know, it's a teaching hospital, a school; but I just use it as an illustration. If one wanted to, it doesn't come from architects or planners, it comes from the management, the doctors or whoever run this thing, to think of building in larger increments. This is poor use of the land. I am not talking just for myself. We all feel it is poor use of land.

MR. WARNECKE: Wasteful of it.

MRS. SAARINEN: Also, I think it's putting the cart before the horse to build the building before you know about the roads.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm just throwing that out as free advice.

MR. WARNECKE: Didn't the history of all these things keep growing and growing and the investment there makes you stay there? You're only looking ahead five or ten years plus or minus.

MR. HANSON: Ten years plus or minus.

MR. WARNECKE: If you look back ten years went by pretty fast.

MR. HANSON: True.

MRS. SAARINEN: That does not look like a temporary building. It's the kind of temporary building that stays 20 years.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Temporary in function is what the title means.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we can just come to it and say it very briefly. We are not going to approve any plan that hasn't any idea of organizing parking and approaches. This has an entrance coming down here somewhere or around here (indicating on sketch). This has some sort of loop way out here (indicating). That's parking and service, and parking and service here (indicating). We think this has a designed thing. This is not designed; it's just two rectangles put on.

MR. HANSON: This, of course, the National Library of Medicine is not part --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Doesn't make any difference. It's U.S. Government and ought to be designed together. Architecturally this is terrible. That's all you can say. There's no architecture to it. First thing we must have is somebody doing a site plan not working on one building. He's recognizing these two, if they have to have it.

MR. HANSON: The National Library of Medicine is

looking forward to expansion of the facility and have approached Congress in the past, as I understand it. I am not fully informed on this. But they were delayed in this, and their plan is to use this area (indicating on sketch) over here as a preliminary plan, shall I say. They need more parking space. They want to use a multilevel parking facility in the area and probably build what office space and so on they need above.

MRS. SAARINEN: All the more reason they should be coordinated because it is going to get closer. They should be thought of in relation to each other.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: I'd like to point out the reason we are taking so much trouble at this point, there are other places in the Institutes of Health where a building might be considered without worrying so much, but this precise location is one where several of the major planning elements are not fully determined. We are not clear about the approach from the outside. We don't know whether there is going to be really an approach or not really an approach. There is an indicated future connection.

MR. HANSON: I should explain that. This has been a point of major contention with the county authorities. They wanted to run an extension of Woodmont Avenue through

this area here (indicating). This is the Child Health Research Center with which I believe you are familiar. The agreement now reached is to eliminate this from their master plan and from our master plan, and we are now studying the possible movement of this building in this direction to permit them to put Woodmont Avenue through and eliminate this six-acre plot that has been prepared for the Glenbrook Parkway extension.

MR. KELLY: This has been explained to us and means the whole corner down there is subject to decision as to whether an entrance comes in or not. There is an indication of a little road coming in there, a sweeping road coming down through. It's not at all clear what the status of that is, and then as you go up from there, each of these buildings has the service on the main side and it's not clear what the front of the building is, how they would relate to each other.

There seems to be no scheme of having one side be service, parking; the other side approach, or anything else. Instead of having a single building, one could have a plan for an increment going through this land but there seems to be no such plan. If it were elsewhere, on the overall site I don't think we'd be going to this much trouble.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That gets back to our basic position, if I may sum up. We specifically disapprove of this building as being badly designed. We also disapprove of the idea of it and think the quality of planning has been inadequate for the importance of this great campus. We have somewhat outlined our objections to the quality of planning that it is not conceiving of this as one large area, and using bulk correctly; that Mr. Bunshaft put his finger on one thing, the future may curse us for missing great opportunities of planning. That is sort of the position of the Commission in relation to this problem.

We hope to be of as much help as we can be on it.

MR. HANSON: Well, of course you have reached your decision, but you leave us --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Not at this moment. We spent a good deal of time on it this morning.

MR. HANSON: You leave us with an extremely difficult operational problem, and that is the virus research work is now being held up because we do not have adequate facilities to actually conduct the research, safe adequate facilities.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We'd be happy to see a proposal for a building to house such facilities in some other location, perhaps, on your campus.

Mr. Sasaki.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, I think since everyone has talked a lot about the planning and site emphasis, there may be over-emphasis on the planning aspect. I think the building, though, we've not said very much about. We don't like the building. We think the building is poorly designed. It may be you come up with a great building and that site would be acceptable to us. Put it that way. I don't want you to spend a lot of time studying the planning --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Are representatives of the architects here?

MR. W. G. RITCHIE (Sanders & Thomas): I'm not an architect. I'd be glad to hear your comments and pass them on.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We don't like the building at all. I thought that was quite obvious. We don't like the siting or even the detailed planning around it. To me -- I don't know how to say it -- this is really not a very professional job. That's what we are trying to say in our broken English, going all around in circles saying that. We are saying this center deserves the best talents there are, and we don't see it there. This is it in a nutshell crudely put, and your viruses are going to have to wait until you get a good solution.

21 February 1966

Dear Mr. Hartzog:

At its meeting on February 15th, 1966, the Commission of Fine Arts approved the proposed design for the square west of Rawlins Park.

The Commission believes, however, that the peripheral tree planting area should be several feet wider to allow more space for tree roots. The grass panels under the magnolia rows should be eliminated and replaced by individual square openings in the paving.

This Commission favors placing a large piece of sculpture across 20th Street from the park and hopes that a suitable piece can be obtained. The Commission also suggests use of moving or bubbling water in the long narrow pools. Careful stonework and excellent detailing will be essential in making this park an attractive asset to the city.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr.
Director
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT J

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

WILLIAM WALTON, Chairman

GORDON BUNSHAFT

ALINE B. SAARINEN

BURNHAM KELLY

HIDEO SASAKI

THEODORE ROSZAK

JOHN CARL WARNECKE

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

15 February 1966

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

Ref: O.G. 66-206

Dear Mr. Green:

At its meeting on February 15, the Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for proposed changes and additions to the Georgetown University Medical Center at 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W.

Three items were presented: a parking deck structure; a temporary parking lot; and an additional wing for the hospital.

The first stage of the parking deck facility was approved. It is a great improvement over the previous proposal and this Commission will look forward to seeing more details as they are developed.

The Commission has no objection to the proposed temporary parking facilities. It is understood that these are to be used only during construction of the permanent parking structures.

The Commission also has no objection to the general massing of the proposed hospital additions, but feels that a more satisfactory design solution should be developed for the surface treatment and fenestration. Of particular importance is the development of a harmonious relationship between the proposed Mental Retardation Unit and following units that will be attached to it. Thus it is extremely important to have a general architectural development scheme presented to this Commission for all adjacent structures.

Our next meeting will be on the 16th and 17th of March. We will be glad to see further developments at that time if they are ready.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
William Walton
Chairman

Mr. J. P. Green
Assistant Superintendent of
Licenses and Permits
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit K.

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
15 February 1966

AM

10:15 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of Next Meeting:

Executive Session: 15 March 1966, 10:15 a.m.

Open Session: 16 March 1966, 9:30 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 1966 Meeting

3. Engineering Report, Extension of West Front of Capitol

III. REVIEWS-SUBMISSIONS

1. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Buildings and Grounds

Central Library - Proposed Design

b. Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Shipstead Luce Act

(a) Building Applications

(b) Santa Maria Facilities, Southwest Waterfront

(c) S.L. 66-73, 1615 North Portal Drive - Design
of Dwellings

(2) Old Georgetown Act

(a) Building Applications

(b) O.G. 66-200, 1814 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., 4
story office building - Proposed Design

(c) O.G. 66-206, 3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W., Additions
and alterations to Georgetown University Medical
Center

2. National Guard Association of the United States

Proposed Monument Commemorating the Service of National Guardsmen in Europe in World Wars I and II

3. National Institutes of Health

Emergency Virus Isolation Facility and Master Plan of NIH

4. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park Development - Revised Design

5. Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company

Telephone Kiosk - Revised Design

IV. LEGISLATION

1. H.R. 12298-1/25/66-Mr. Pepper-89th C

To require that at least 1 per cent of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings.

2. S.2338-7/28/65-Mr. Symington-89th C

To authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to General John J. Pershing.

LUNCH

V. INTERVIEWS

3:00 1. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Central Library - Proposed Design

(Mr. G.A. Purcell, Liaison Officer, D.C. Dept. of Buildings and Grounds; Mies Van Der Rohe, architect)

3:30 2. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park Development - Revised Design

(Representatives of National Capital Region)

4:00

3. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses
and Inspections

O.G. 66-206, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W., Additions and
alterations to Georgetown University Medical Center

(Representatives of Mariani and Associates, architects)

